Towards a Common Approach to Thinking about and Measuring Social Inclusion

Copyright © L'Institut Roeher Institute

All rights reserved. The use of any part of this publication reproduced, transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, or stored in a retrieval system, without the prior consent of the publisher is an infringement of copyright law.

Towards a Common Approach to Thinking about and Measuring Social Inclusion

L'Insitut Roeher Institute
Kinsmen Building, York University
4700 Keele St. Toronto, Ontario, Canada
M3J 1P3
Tel.: (416) 661-9611
Fax: (416) 661-5701
TDD: (416) 661-2023
info@roeher.ca

Institute President
Cameron Crawford

Written by
Cameron Crawford

Design and Production
is five COMMUNICATIONS

The recommended citation for this publication is: The Roeher Institute, Towards a Common Approach to Thinking about and Measuring Social Inclusion. Toronto, ON: The Roeher Institute.

Contents

I. Overview 1

II. Background 3

III. A Working Definition of Social Inclusion 5

IV. Valued Situations 7

V. Essential Conditions 9

VI. Practical Means of Participating 11

A. *Societally Organized* 11

B. *Organized at the Individual Level* 12

VII. Measuring Social Inclusion 15

A. *The Access Dimension* 15

B. *The Support Dimension* 15

C. *Ratios and Indices of Social Inclusion* 16

VIII. Conclusion 19

ENDOTES 20

APPENDIX 21

BIBLIOGRAPHY 25

I. Overview

This paper presents a way of thinking about social inclusion that is grounded in perspectives and values that have evolved within the disability community in recent years. The approach may be useful to other social sectors as well.

The discussion provides an overview of The Roeher Institute's interest in issues of social inclusion and situates that concern in the context of the Canadian disability community's ongoing efforts to further the full inclusion and participation of people with disabilities in the social and economic life of society. The discussion briefly touches on governmental policy statements in Canada that address issues of inclusion concerning persons with disabilities.

The discussion provides a working definition of social inclusion and explores two key dimensions — basic access to socially valued situations and the supports necessary to enable people with disabilities to participate as valued equals in those situations. It describes supports for participation that are organized at the societal or systems (macro) level, and those that are organized at the individual (or micro) level. The discussion then presents a way of measuring social inclusion that takes into account the access and support dimensions, pointing to the applicability of the particular example given (concerning employment) to other situations.

II. Background

The Roeher Institute is an organization that researches issues of public policy and disability from a human rights and inclusion perspective. Issues of social inclusion are of fundamental interest and concern to The Institute because experiences of social, economic and many other forms of exclusion are widespread in the disability community.

For example, the employment situation of people with disabilities compared with the rest of the population is very poor: they face high unemployment and high levels of non-participation in the labour force (The Roeher Institute, 1993a; Brown et al, 1997; Gosling & Cotterill, 2000; FPT Ministers Responsible for Social Services, 2000; Canada, HRDC, 2002). People with disabilities have lower incomes and face greater depths of poverty than people without disabilities (Torjman, 1988; FPT Ministers Responsible for Social Services, 2002). Access to and accommodation within early childhood development programs has been a persistent issue (The Roeher Institute, 1993b; Canadian Institute of Child Health, 1994 and 2002). Children and youth face a range of exclusions from good quality regular educational programs at the elementary, secondary and post-secondary levels (The Roeher Institute, 1996; National Educational Association of Disabled Students, 1996). Access to adult literacy and adult basic education programs has been hampered by many factors (The Roeher Institute, 1989, 1991 and 1999). Mainstream employment training arrangements do not place major emphasis on ensuring that people with disabilities have access to programs (The Roeher Institute, 2003, In Press). People with disabilities experience higher levels of violence and abuse than the rest of the population, and even still there are insufficient supports in place for people with disabilities to count on effective protections and justice from police and the courts (The Roeher Institute, 1995). Numerous barriers confront parents of children with disabilities in their efforts to foster their children's inclusion in the community (The Roeher Institute, 2000a and 2000b). Hundreds of thousands of Canadians with disabilities lack the human supports (e.g., attendants, interpreters, supportive co-workers), assistive technologies and other supports they need to participate in a range of social and economic activities (FPT Ministers Responsible for Social Services, 2000; The Roeher Institute, 2001a). Genetic and other forms of technology are being developed based on negative stereotypes about the value of people with disabilities and on negative assumptions about their place in society (The Roeher Institute, 2002). Loneliness is a widespread fact of life for many people with disabilities (The Roeher Institute, 1990; Pavri, 2001; Vanier, 2002).

Concern about inclusion and exclusion policy issues for the disability community dates back to the late 1960's in Canada and has been a consistent preoccupation since then. Such concern became clearly evident in early efforts to move people from institutions to the community beginning in the mid-1960's. Building on that momentum an early vision of community living and human rights was articulated in an important Ontario Green Paper in the early 1970's (Welch, 1973). The Obstacles Report of 1981

(Canada, 1981) presented poignant testimony of the multiple points of exclusion and disadvantage experienced by people with disabilities and articulated a call to action for governments in Canada to address this situation. Throughout the 1990's the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Persons with Disabilities produced numerous reports that touched on the issue, as did individual organizations within the disability community. The "Mainstream 1992" process and report (FPT Review of Social Services, 1993) presented a comprehensive vision of a more inclusive and enabling society and pointed to government commitments and policy instruments that were needed. The "Social Security Review" of 1994 (Canada, 1994) presented a model of funding that holds promise of furthering the social and economic inclusion and participation of people with disabilities. The "Scott Task Force" of 1996 (Canada, Federal Task Force on Disability Issues, 1996) did much the same following extensive consultations with the disability community. The In Unison report of 1998 (FPT Ministers Responsible for Social Services, 1998) presented a consensus view of the disability community and federal/provincial/territorial governments concerning broad features of a more enabling and inclusive society. That document continues to serve as a basis for discussion between the disability community, governments and society more generally.

Subsequent proposals from the NGO sector have been presented for public consideration and discussion to carry In Unison into effect (Council of Canadians with Disabilities, 1999; Battle and Torjman, 2002; The Roeher Institute, 2002). Several provincial governments have developed their own approaches to furthering social inclusion that attempt to address issues articulated in previous work in the area (Prince Edward Island, Disability Support Program, current but undated; Ontario, 2001; Manitoba, undated). A recent Federal Government report is entitled "Advancing the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities (Canada, Human Resources Development Canada, 2002).

Concern about and interest in issues of social inclusion extends beyond the disability community. There is a huge body of literature on the subject. Governments within the European Union have developed country-level National Action Plans for Inclusion that aim to advance the social and economic situation of marginalized groups, including women, racial and cultural minorities, newcomers and people of low socio-economic status (Atkinson et al, 2002). Similar work is being done in 'health population research,' such as efforts by Health Canada in the Atlantic region (Shookner, 2000) and by the Canadian Council on Social Development (2000).

As approaches to thinking about social inclusion have evolved in reference to various social sectors and issues (e.g., ethno-racial difference, age, gender, disability, income-status, newcomers, etc.) there has been considerable diversity and even confusion in terms of definitions and dimensions of social inclusion (Cushing, 2003).

Despite such disparate approaches, common themes and interests are clearly evident. Notable are issues of individual and entire community marginalization from — and integration/full participation within — 'valued equal' status in the economic, cultural, political, social and interpersonal domains (Cushing, 2003). Also notable is that exclusion impacts a greater number of people than it seems to at first glance, once longitudinal data/cycles are taken into account. Factors that contribute to exclusion are interwoven and mutually exacerbating. There is some common agreement on the principle triggers of exclusion, and that since it often takes multiple triggers, there is hope for developing ways to minimize the occurrence of at least some triggers to extend people's capacity to keep from being socially excluded.

105-05222/

III. A Working Definition of Social Inclusion

Stepping back and reflecting on The Institute's research and on the recurring values and societal-change goals within the disability community over the years, at least two key themes emerge. People with disabilities want to be socially included in the sense that they, like others, want:

- To participate as valued, appreciated equals in the social, economic, political and cultural life of the community (i.e. in valued societal situations)[1].
- To be involved in mutually trusting, appreciative and respectful interpersonal relationships at the family, peer and community levels.

That is, people want into the situations that most people take for granted and want to be welcomed and valued, there.

IV. Valued Situations

Valued societal situations in which people want to participate include:

- Early childhood development opportunities.
- Good quality regular elementary and secondary education with age peers.
- Post-secondary education or training.
- A job or career and income security in the event of unemployment.
- An affordable, healthy and pleasant home that meets individual and family needs.
- A safe, secure, healthy and pleasant neighbourhood.
- Justice in the event of violence or abuse.
- Recreational opportunities and chances for cultural/artistic expression.
- Shops, places of commerce and other consumer options.
- Health, social and related services.
- Clubs, faith communities, voluntary associations.
- The Internet or "information highway" more broadly.
- Opportunities/venues for civic involvement (e.g., through public, private or voluntary-sector governance arrangements; social and economic development processes; social justice or charitable causes, etc.).
- Partnerships with like-minded people working for common purposes.
- The political process.

Valued interpersonal situations in which people want to participate include:

- Family, a variety of friendships[2] and relationships with trusted, respectful others in the community.

V. Essential Conditions

In order to participate in valued societal and interpersonal situations, two essential conditions must be met. First, people need to ***be in*** or have ***access to*** those situations in the first place — the access dimension. For instance, a labour market that includes people of colour, Aboriginal persons and people with disabilities at the level of employment for society taken as a whole might be considered — at least on first glance — an accessible labour market. Such accessibility is particularly convincing where people with disabilities garner roughly the same level of benefit from participating (in this case financial) as dominant groups. An early childhood service or school that ensures that the proportion of enrolled children with disabilities (e.g., 5 per cent of all enrolees) is very similar to the naturally-occurring prevalence rate of disability in the community (e.g., 5 per cent prevalence in the child population) might be deemed accessible. Such program accessibility is even more palpable where young people with disabilities reap essentially the same benefits from participation as other children. For example, the education level achieved so far is on par with the education level of age peers in general, or parental perceptions of the educational progress of children with and without disabilities are similar.

Second, once in a given situation, people also need to ***have the practical means*** necessary to participate as appreciated, valued equals — the support dimension. For example, it may be that a school is accessible in terms of the basic 'head counts' of children with disabilities in relation to other children. However, the school may be making little or no provision to ensure that children with disabilities are in regular classrooms with the human, instructional, technological and material supports needed for effective learning with their age peers. Where this is the case, then the school would be doing little to facilitate meaningful participation of the nominally 'included' children; such a school would not be substantively inclusive. Indeed, prevailing conditions at the school will likely foster the frustration, stigmatization, failure and potentially the premature school leaving of the children who seem to be 'included'.

Similarly, a company may routinely undertake massive recruitment drives to solicit prospective employees with disabilities, and may even hire significant numbers of people with disabilities, annually. However, the company may make little or no provision to accommodate disability in the workplace by means of accessible washrooms/elevators, flexible work routines, supportive co-worker culture, ergonomic workstations, accessible professional development and so on. Practically speaking, the means needed are not in place for the newly hired employees with disabilities to contribute as valued equals in furthering the company's mission. Management and co-workers could very well come to view these people as incompetent, unproductive employees who are a drain on the firm. Such a company does not provide a substantively inclusive workplace and will predictably be dealing with high turnover of employees with disabilities.

An inclusive arrangement or society, then, is one that fosters equality of access to valued situations while ensuring that the practical means or conditions are in place to facilitate the participation of all as appreciated, valued equals.

VI. Practical Means of Participating

Practical means of ensuring access to and participation in valued situations can be organized at the societal/institutional/systems level and at the individual level.

A. Societally Organized

Means of participation that are organized at the societal/institutional/systems level would include:

- Open and accommodating authority/power structures and power relations that have the potential to strengthen individual or group capacity (e.g., consultative mechanisms where input received from marginalized individuals/groups has significant bearing on formulation of policy objectives, priorities and resource allocation decisions that stand to benefit marginalized persons).
- Measures to ensure recognition of individual/group presence and value (e.g., company or school values statements; policies and leadership initiatives that establish appreciation of human diversity as an operating norm).
- Non discriminatory practices:
  - for ensuring access (e.g., non-discriminatory outreach, hiring, enrolment and service provision practices; "zero rejection" policies at day care centres, schools and other community-based social services; physically accessible court houses).
  - for securing individual involvement/attachment (e.g., flexible work-leave provisions; flexible exam-taking or attendance policies at a school or college; individualization of job tasks or learning expectations; evidence-taking procedures in courts of law that can accommodate people with hearing, speech or cognitive difficulties; procedures for hospital emergency rooms to bring sign language interpreters on site to assist physicians in communicating with deaf persons).
  - for promoting human achievement/contribution (e.g., accessible professional development opportunities; school curricula or recreational programs that recognize and foster individual strengths and talents rather than holding everyone to the same standard).
- Measures to identify and remove barriers to access, participation and contribution (e.g., barrier identification and removal processes under employment equity/contractor compliance programs; accessibility audits conducted by schools, colleges, universities, municipalities, provincial and federal governments and places of commerce).
- Group supports for participation (e.g., accessible community transportation; barrier-free design in workplaces, places of commerce, schools/colleges, recreation centres, municipal services and new hous-

ing complexes; policies requiring recognition of prior learning and experience of people with limited formal education when determining their eligibility for adult training and upgrading).
- Measures to recognize individual achievement and contribution (e.g., in workplace-based performance appraisals, in reporting on student progress).
- Processes, mechanisms and resources to facilitate communication, common undertakings and sharing of knowledge about effective inclusionary practices within marginalized groups (e.g., disability awareness within the South East Asian community) and between marginalized and dominant groups. Such practical mechanisms and resources include symposia, roundtables, joint planning sessions, online bulletin boards, accessibility guidelines and so on.

Societally organized means of participation do not apply uniformly across all valued situations in which people seek to be included. For instance, measures to recognize individual achievement and contribution may not be very relevant in relation to disabled consumers of health, social and related services, but would be quite pertinent concerning employees with disabilities who work in those situations.

B. Organized at the Individual Level

Means of enabling participation in valued societal situations can also be organized at the individual or personal level in the sense that they "attach" to individuals rather than to institutions or systems. Such supports would include:

- An adequate supply of money (e.g., to purchase consumer goods at the accessible grocery store; to buy a new suit needed for work; to purchase school supplies; to take an accessible taxi to the accessible court house; to pay for accessibility retrofits in the personal home). An adequate supply of money is a ubiquitous and necessary condition of participation across a wide range of valued situations.
- Disability-related individual/personal supports (e.g., an attendant, interpreter or wheelchair to be available and portable across a wide spectrum of situations in order to enable participation in those situations in the course of an ordinary day, such as going from work to the grocery store to home and then to the recreation centre or night class).
- Information about opportunities for participation in the community (e.g., about: job vacancies, accessible continuing education programs or accessible recreation options in the provincial parks system) and about available resources to enable participation (e.g., how to secure funding for an interpreter or tutor to assist with evening courses; information about the availability of subsidies for accessible housing in the new development across town).
- Acquired knowledge/skills (e.g., knowledge/skills needed for employment; as a marker of progress in the education system; the 'know how' needed to bring an incident of violence/abuse to the attention of the justice system).
- Personal agency/self-determination (i.e., a personal desire to participate/be involved in society, a sense of purpose, a sense of having significant 'say' and personal control in various situations — that one's presence, aspirations and choices matter).
- Health (as a general resource to enable participation across a variety of valued situations).

On the interpersonal level, means of participation that attach to individuals include:

- Sufficient time (e.g., for visiting with family or friends).
- Proximity & personal mobility (i.e., being within practical reach of family or friends).
- Communicative possibilities (e.g., to enable dialogue between: people who are hearing and deaf; people who use spoken language and those who do not; people with significantly different cognitive capacities; people who do not share the same spoken language; people who are at remote distances from one another such as by means of telephone, relay messaging or e-mail).
- Common interest/experience (i.e., a rationale or incentive for being in the relationship in the first place).
- Personal agency/self-determination (i.e., a sense of having significant 'say' and control in interpersonal relationships that are reciprocal).
- Enough disposable money to have a social life (e.g., to go out to dinner, to a play or to a game with family/friends; to be able to pay for the accessible taxi needed to visit with a friend).

Table 1 in the Appendix shows the relationship between various valued situations and the practical means necessary to participate as valued, appreciated equals.

VII. Measuring Social Inclusion

A. The Access Dimension

Establishing whether people are in particular situations is a fairly straightforward matter of asking questions such as, "did the person without employment receive income assistance?", "is the person working in the reference week?", "is the person going to school?", and so on. In terms of measurement, major population surveys can be used to establish the situation of people with disabilities compared to that of others (e.g., comparative percentages in paid employment). In some cases, however, Canadian population surveys are silent on issues of access (e.g., access to the justice system by people with disabilities who have experienced violence or abuse). We are presently reviewing major population surveys to identify variables that will help shed light on access issues.

Some nuancing of the data may be required in order to control for individual preferences and capacity. For instance, some people with disabilities consider themselves completely prevented from working because of their condition. When looking at the comparative situation of people with and without disabilities in employment, it might be wise to filter from the analysis people who consider themselves completely prevented from employment. [3]

B. The Support Dimension

It is more challenging to use major population surveys to measure the extent to which the supports needed for participation are in place, particularly supports that are organized at the community/systems level. For instance, we do not have large scale population survey data on the participation of people with disabilities in the political or policy process, or on their experiences in that connection (e.g., sense of being valued, taken seriously and having significant impact on policy priorities and resource allocation decisions).

Having said this, limited information is available at the individual respondent level that allows us to draw inferences about the supports for participation at the community level. For instance, the Health and Activity Limitation Survey (HALS)/Participation and Activity Limitation Survey (PALS) has questions about needed job accommodations and their availability in the workplace. Such information points to the accessibility and supportiveness of workplaces. In PALS there is information about the accessibility of community transportation, facilities, equipment and programs for leisure activities, and information about the accessibility and suitability of work-related training. A difficulty, here, is that we do not have similar information concerning people without disabilities, so cannot do comparative analysis.

We are presently reviewing major population surveys for variables that shed some light

on supports for participation that are organized at the community/systems level and at the individual level.

C. Ratios and Indices of Social Inclusion

By themselves, discrete pieces of information about access to and support for participation within valued situations are illuminating. However, the information is disparate and difficult to interpret taken as a whole. What, for instance, are we to understand about social inclusion on the employment front when we establish the following?

- The relative all-year employment level of people with disabilities is 44.4 per cent that of people without disabilities (26 per cent with disabilities are employed all year compared with 58.5 per cent of people without disabilities).
- The relative position of people with disabilities in employment increases to 78.8 per cent when we filter out of the analysis people who consider themselves completely prevented from working because of their disability.
- Among people with employment income, the wages of people with disabilities are 85.6 per cent those of people without ($22,588 compared with $26,358).
- Of a possible thirteen supports for employment that could be needed in the workplace[4], most employed people don't need any, and among the people who do, an average of 1.235 of the average 2.044 needed are actually available.
- Among people not in the labour force, only 33.9 per cent report that they do not face external barriers that discourage people from seeking employment.[5]

A way to begin making sense of this information is to construct a composite index for the access and support dimensions of inclusion, in this particular instance on the employment front.

The analysis would filter out people who consider themselves completely prevented from working because of disability.

Each component of the index would comprise two values:

ACCESS

Relative Employment-Population Ratio (REPR)
Relative Wages and Salaries Ratio (RWSR)

SUPPORT

Job Accommodation Ratio (JAR)
Barriers to Employment Ratio (BER)

REPR[6]

The REPR is defined as the relative extent to which people with disabilities who consider themselves able to work are actually working all year, taking the percentage for the non-disabled population as the benchmark. The formula is the percentage of people with disabilities employed all year divided by the percentage employed all year among people without disabilities = 46.1% ÷ 58.5% = 78.8 %. The REPR would be 100 per cent if people with disabilities were participating all year in employment to the same degree as people without.

RSWR[7]

The RSWR is defined as the extent to which people with disabilities financially benefit from employment compared with people who do not have disabilities. The formula is wages of persons with disabilities divided by wages of people without disabilities = $22,588 ÷ $26,358 = 85.7%.[8] The RSWR would be 100 per cent if

people with disabilities had the same level of remuneration from employment as people without disabilities.

Access Index

The relative access of people with disabilities to the paid labour force and to the financial benefits of participation is defined as the average of the REPR and the RSWR ((78.8% + 85.7%) ÷ 2) = 82.3%. A perfectly accessible labour market would enable the same level of participation in all-year employment and the same level of financial benefit for people with and without disabilities and would have a score of 100 per cent.

JAR[9]

The JAR is defined as the extent to which employed people have the needed employment supports or job accommodations. Among people who need any such supports, the average number needed is 2.044. The average number of supports actually available to those who need them is 1.235. The JAR, then, is 1.235 ÷ 2.044 = 60.4%. In an ideal labour market, 100 per cent of employed people with disabilities who need employment supports would have them.

BER[10]

The BER is defined as the extent to which people with disabilities who are not in the labour force face no barriers to employment that discourage them from looking for work. This was the case for only 33.9 per cent of working age people not in the labour force who did not consider themselves completely prevented from work because of disability in 1991. In an ideal world, no one would face such barriers. (i.e., 100 per cent would report no such barriers).

Support Index

The supports for employment score is defined as the average of the JAR and the BER ((60.4% + 33.9%) ÷ 2) = 47.2%. A completely supportive labour market (i.e., support score = 100 per cent) would ensure that employed people with disabilities have all the needed supports in their jobs and that those not in the labour force would face no barriers that discourage their search for employment.

Social Inclusion Index - Employment

Social inclusion in employment can be defined as the average of the access score and the support score ((82.3 % + 47.2%) ÷ 2) = 64.8%. A fully accessible labour market would have a score of 100 per cent. It would represent a situation in which people with disabilities participate to the same extent in employment as others for the same level of financial benefit, have all the supports needed for employment and face no external barriers that discourage the search for employment.

Frequency of Construction

Taken individually, the Access Score and Support Score say something meaningful about the labour force participation of people with disabilities and could be constructed as statistical data become available. Because the Access Score in this particular example is based on SLID, it can be constructed about every two years. As the Support Score shown here is based on PALS, it, like the full Social Inclusion Index for Employment, would be constructed less frequently — about every five years.

An alternative to using the PALS support variables might be to use Workplace and Employee Survey variables that ask whether people are with an employer that has career or recruitment programs for persons with disabilities, and whether people have access to the disability-related job supports that they need. This approach would allow for more frequent construction of the Inclusion — Employment index, but the index would be less sensitive than that based on PALS as it would not comprise

the range of indicators available in PALS.

Weights

The approach explored here does not assign differential weights to any of the source variables that make up the ratios and indices.

Differential weights could be assigned to components of the JAR and BER that reflect the extent to which particular employment supports are needed or employment barriers are encountered.

The relative weights of the JAR and BER to one another could be adjusted within the Support Index, as could the REPR and RSWR within the Access Index. The relative weights of the Access and Support indices to one another could also be adjusted within the Social Inclusion — Employment Index. A clear theoretical basis for making such adjustments would be required, however.

Other Ratios and Indices

Theoretically, a range of ratios and indices could be constructed to measure social inclusion in valued situations aside from employment. Considerable further work would be required to design and test such indices. We are presently exploring major population surveys for variables that can be used in this connection.

IX. Conclusion

This paper has provided one approach to thinking about and measuring the concept of social inclusion as it applies to people with disabilities. It is grounded on Roeher Institute research and on international research and models that point to two dimensions that together contribute to social inclusion for persons with disabilities — the access and the support dimensions. Arguably, it is not enough for people to simply have access to valued situations. Without the supports needed to participate as appreciated equals in those situations, the social, economic, cultural, political and interpersonal access of people with disabilities is tenuous and their substantive inclusion in the longer term is unlikely.

The discussion explores a practical approach to measuring social inclusion that takes into account both the access and support dimensions. While the discussion limits itself to the employment front, it has possibilities that extend to many other fronts as well. The notion of combining an access and support dimension in social inclusion indices may be applicable to other marginalized groups; detailed consideration is needed of supportive conditions that are relevant to such groups and of the availability of information from major population surveys about such supportive conditions.

Where conditions yield progressively higher scores on both the access and support dimensions, we can infer with some confidence that progress is being achieved in advancing social inclusion. Where advancements stall on either of these dimensions, it is also likely that progress towards social inclusion has stalled.

Construction of practical measurement and analytic tools will further understanding of where and why progress towards social inclusion is being achieved or frustrated. Analysis of the source data that make up such tools will help fix our sights on problem areas that require responses at the policy, program and community development levels.

Endnotes

1. The community may be a community of common language, culture, interest or experience (e.g., the deaf community, the Six Nations community, the Chinese community). Or the community may be a broader entity comprising diverse communities of language, culture, interest or experience (e.g., Toronto, Canadian society).

2 i.e., not only with people who have disabilities.

3 It is not clear to what extent this sense of complete inability is fuelled by external barriers, such as the prospect of losing publicly-financed health, medications, housing and other supports if employed.

4 Accessible architecture and work areas (handrails, ramps, appropriate parking, elevators, workstations washrooms and other modified features); human support (reader, interpreter, job coach, personal assistant) technical aids and devices, communication services (print-to-Braille conversion, audio tape, enlarged print), job redesign (modified or different duties), modified hours or days or reduced work hours, accessible transportation, various other supports.

5 i.e., would lose some or all of current income or additional supports (drug plan, housing) if working; family or friends have discouraged going to work; family responsibilities prevent work; information about jobs is not accessible; worry about being isolated by other workers on the job; have been the victim of discrimination; training is not adequate; lack of accessible transportation; no jobs available; various other factors.

6 Based on the Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (SLID) 1994.

7 Based on SLID 1994.

8 The data are only for people who had employment income in 1994.

9 Based on HALS 1991.

10 Based on HALS 1991.

Appendix

Table 1. Social Inclusion: Ends, Valued Situations, Necessary Conditions and Practical Means of Participation

Objective, goal or end state	Examples of valued situations	Necessary conditions		Practical means of actualizing necessary conditions	Results
Participation by all as valued, appreciated equals in the social, economic, political and cultural life of the community (i.e., in valued societal situations). The community may be a community of common language, culture, interest or experience or may be a broader entity comprising diverse communities of language, culture, interest or experience (e.g., Toronto, Canadian society).	**Societal situations (social, economic, cultural, political)**	**Being in / having access to valued situations.**	**Having the means needed for participating in valued situations.**	**<u>Societal means (means attached to institutions/systems)</u>** Open and accommodating authority/power structures and relations that have the potential to strengthen individual or group capacity. Measures to ensure recognition of individual/group presence and value. Non discriminatory practices: - for ensuring access. - for securing individual involvement/attachment. - for promoting human achievement/contribution. Measures to identify and remove barriers to access, participation and contribution. Group supports for participation (e.g., accessible transportation; barrier free design; recognition of prior learning). Measures to recognize individual achievement and contribution. Processes/mechanisms/tools to facilitate communication, common undertakings and sharing of knowledge/insight about effective inclusionary practices within and between marginalized and dominant groups. **<u>Personal means (means attached to persons)</u>** Adequate supply of money.	**<u>For institutions/systems</u>** Diversity of experience, skills and perspectives as inputs. Mutual learning and social/cultural benefit. Diversification of social relations with communities; enhanced external approval and legitimacy. Potential for more robust, responsive, innovative and versatile systems/institutions. <u>For individuals</u> Confidence and self-esteem through others' recognition of presence, value and contribution. Social connectedness / cohesion.
	Early childhood development opportunities. Good quality regular elementary and secondary education with age peers. Post-secondary education or training. A job or career. Income security in the event of unemployment. An affordable, healthy and pleasant home that meets individual and family needs. A safe, secure, healthy and pleasant neighbourhood. Justice in the event of violence or abuse. Recreational opportunities and chances for cultural/artistic expression.				

Objective, goal or end state	Examples of valued situations	Necessary conditions		Practical means of actualizing necessary conditions	Results
	Shops, places of commerce and other consumer options. Health, social and related services. Clubs, faith communities, voluntary associations. The "information highway". Opportunities/venues for civic involvement (e.g., through public, private or voluntary-sector governance arrangements; social and economic development processes; social justice or charitable causes, etc.). Partnerships with like-minded people working for common purposes. Political process. Other valued situations.			Individual / personal supports (e.g., attendant; interpreter; wheelchair). Information. Acquired knowledge/skill. Personal agency/ self-determination. Health.	Greater personal security (emotional, social, economic). Enhanced personal development. Improvements in / maintenance of general health & well-being, including ability to cope with stress and sense of purposefulness and control.

Interpersonal situations

Involvement of all in mutually trusting, appreciative and respectful interpersonal relationships at the family, peer and community levels.	Family. Friendships with diverse peers. Relationships with trusted, respectful others in the community.	**Being in valued inter-personal relationships.**	**Having the means needed for participating in valued relationships.**	**Personal means (means attached to persons)** Sufficient time. Proximity & personal mobility. Communicative possibilities. Common interest/experience. Personal agency/ self-determination. Enough disposable money to have a social life.	For individuals Confidence and self-esteem through others' recognition of presence, value and contribution. Social connectedness / cohesion. Greater personal security (emotional, social, economic). Enhanced personal development. Improvements in / maintenance of general health & well-being, including ability to cope with stress and sense of purposefulness and control.

Bibliography

Atkinson, T., Cantillon, B., et al (2002). Social Indicators - The EU and Social Inclusion. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Battle, K. and Torjman, S. (2002). Social Policy that Works: An Agenda. Ottawa: Caledon Institute.

Brown, I., Raphael, R. and Renwick, R. (1997). Quality of Life: Dream or Reality? Toronto: Centre for Health Promotion, University of Toronto Press.

Canada (1981). Obstacles Report -- Report of the Special Parliamentary Committee on the Disabled and the Handicapped. Ottawa: Special Parliamentary Committee on the Disabled and the Handicapped.

Canada, Federal/Provincial/Territorial Review of Services Affecting Canadians with Disabilities (1993). Pathway to Integration: Final Report, Mainstream 1992.

Canada (1994). Improving Social Security in Canada, Persons With Disabilities: A Supplementary Paper. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.

Canada, Federal Task Force on Disability Issues (1996). Equal Citizenship For Canadians With Disabilities: The Will To Act.

Canada, Human Resources Development Canada (2002). Advancing the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities: A Government of Canada Report. Ottawa: Human Resources Development Canada.

Canadian Council on Social Development (2000). Social Cohesion in Canada: Possible Indicators. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development.

Canadian Institute of Child Health (1994). The Health of Canada's Children: A CICH Profile, 2nd Edition. Ottawa: Canadian Institute of Child Health.

Canadian Institute of Child Health (2000). The Health of Canada's Children: A CICH Profile, 3rd Edition. Ottawa: Canadian Institute of Child Health.

Council of Canadians with Disabilities (1999). A National Strategy for Persons with Disabilities: The Community Definition.

Cushing, P. (2003, in press). Report on Social Inclusion and Exclusion Policies. Toronto: The Roeher Institute.

Federal, Provincial and Territorial Ministers Responsible for Social Services (1998). In Unison: A Canadian Approach to Disability Issues. Ottawa: Human Resources Development Canada.

Federal, Provincial and Territorial Ministers Responsible for Social Services (2000). In Unison 2000: Persons with Disabilities in Canada. Ottawa: Human Resources Development Canada.

Gosling, V. & Cotterill, L. (2000). An Employment Project As a Route to Social Inclusion for People with Learning Difficulties? Disability and Society, 15 (7): 1001-18.

Hubka, D. and Killean, E. (1996). Employment Opportunities for Post-secondary Students and Graduates with Disabilities: A National Study. Ottawa: National Educational Association of Disabled Students.

Manitoba (undated). Full Citizenship: A Manitoba Provincial Strategy on Disability.

Ontario (2001). Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2001. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Pavri, S. (2001). Loneliness in Children with Disabilities: How Teachers Can Help. Teaching Exceptional Children, 33 (6): 52- 58. (Council for Exceptional Children).

Prince, M. (2002). Establishing Intergovernmental Leadership on Disability Issues: Current Roles and Reform Options for a National Policy on Disability Supports. Victoria: Author.

Prince Edward Island, Disability Support Program (undated but current). Questions and Answers on the new Disability Support Program. Charlottetown: Disability Support Program.

The Roeher Institute (1989). Literacy and Labels: A Look at Literacy Policy and People with Mental Handicaps. North York: The Roeher Institute.

The Roeher Institute (1990). Making Friends: Developing Relationships between People with a Disability and Other Members of the Community. North York: The Roeher Institute.

The Roeher Institute (1991). Changing Canadian Schools: Perspectives on Disability and Inclusion. North York: The Roeher Institute.

The Roeher Institute (1993a). On Target: Canada's Employment-related Programs for Persons with Disabilities. North York: The Roeher Institute.

The Roeher Institute (1993b). Right Off the Bat: A Study of Inclusive Child Care in Canada. North York: The Roeher Institute.

The Roeher Institute (1995). Harm's Way: The Many Faces of Violence and Abuse Against Persons with Disabilities in Canada. North York: The Roeher Institute.

The Roeher Institute (1996). Building Bridges: Inclusive Post-Secondary Education for People with Intellectual Disabilities. North York: The Roeher Institute.

The Roeher Institute (1999). Literacy, Disability and Communication: Making the Connection. North York: The Roeher Institute.

The Roeher Institute (2000a). Beyond the Limits: Mothers Caring for Children with Disabilities. Toronto: The Roeher Institute.

The Roeher Institute (2000b). Count Us In: A Demographic Overview of Children and Disability in Canada. Toronto: The Roeher Institute.

The Roeher Institute (2001a). Moving In Unison into Action: Towards a Policy Strategy for Improving Access to Disability Supports. Toronto: The Roeher Institute.

The Roeher Institute (2001b). Striking a new balance: Proposal for a joint federal-provincial/territorial disability supports investment initiative. Toronto: The Roeher Institute.

The Roeher Institute (2002). The Construction of Disability and Risk in Genetic Counselling Discourse. Toronto: The Roeher Institute.

The Roeher Institute (2003, in press). Labour Market Policy and Programs in Canada for Persons with Disabilities. Ottawa: Human Resources Development Canada Applied Research Branch.

Shookner, M. (2000). An Inclusion Lens: Workbook for Looking at Social and Economic Exclusion and Inclusion. Produced with the assistance of the Social Inclusion Reference Group. http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/hppb/regions/atlantic/news/index.html

Torjman, S. (1988). Income Insecurity: The Disability Income System in Canada. North York: The Roeher Institute.

Vanier, J. (2002). A Gift to Give. Transition Magazine, 31 (1).

Welch, R. (1973). Community Living for the Mentally Retarded in Ontario: A New Policy Focus. Toronto: S.N.